

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gev

107044-0007	"		
107044-0007 9684 EXAMINER CHANEY, CAROL DIANE			
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
		1745	
	CHANEY, CA		

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application I	No.	Applicant(s)	U		
Office Action Summary	09/837,834		COREY ET AL.			
	Examiner		Art Unit			
	Carol Chane		1745			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, in the statutory within the statutory will apply and will execuse the application.	however, may a reply be tim y minimum of thirty (30) days pire SIX (6) MONTHS from to ton to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timel the mailing date of this c (35 U.S.C. § 133).	y. ommunication.		
Status						
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 February 2004</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1,2,5-7,10-12,15,16,19,20 and 23</u> is/a 7) Claim(s) <u>3,4,8,9,13,14,17,18,21 and 22</u> is/are 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consi are rejected. objected to.		·			
Application Papers						
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 18 April 2001 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.) accepted of drawing(s) be hetion is required i	neld in abeyance. See if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 Cl			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) 5) 6)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal Pa		O-152)		

a

Art Unit: 1745

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 24 February 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 6, 7, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bahar et al., US Patent RE 37656

Bahar et al. disclose a composite layered structure comprising an expanded polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) membrane impregnated with an ion exchange material. The ion exchange material substantially impregnates the membrane so as to render an interior volume of the membrane substantially occlusive, and thus impermeable to water and carbonaceous fuel. (column 2, lines 43-64.) In a preferred embodiment, NAFION is brushed onto both sides of a microporous PTFE membrane, thus providing protonically conductive membranes on both sides of an impervious layer. (Column 11, lines 38-53.) The filled micropores in the PTFE are sites which allow protonically

Art Unit: 1745

Ü

membrane disclosed by Bahar et al. includes a central "barrier layer" of expanded PTFE, which is a substantially protonically non-conductive material and layers of NAFION on both sides of the barrier. As noted by the applicants, the expanded PTFE has a porous microstructure. Since these pores are filled with NAFION, they provide passages through the barrier layer enabling protonically conductive contact through the passages between the first and second membranes, as recited in applicants' claims.

It would appear that the size of the pores in applicants barrier layer distinguishes applicants invention from the prior art. As note by the applicants, in the instant invention, the pores in barrier layer 34 need only be large enough (relative to barrier thickness) to allow the proton conductive membrane materials 36a, 36b to make contact through the barrier layer, while remaining small enough to prevent the passage of liquid water, and to some extent methanol.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bahar et al. for reasons of record. The rejection is repeated below for convenience.

As discussed above, Bahar et al. disclose applicants' invention essentially as claimed, with the exception that Bahar et al. do not specifically disclose a direct oxidation fuel cell, or the catalytic and diffusion layers for such a fuel cell. Bahar et al. teach that the ion exchange materials of their inventive membrane may be include

Art Unit: 1745

powders such as carbon black, graphite, nickel, silica, titanium dioxide, or platinum black to provide catalytic effects. (Column 5, lines 2-11.) Therefore, catalyst layers as recited in applicants claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 23 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based upon the teachings of Bahar et al.

Bahar et al. teach the membrane of the present invention may be used for a fuel cells and the use of the membrane results in fuel cells with improved ionic conductance and water transport across the membrane, and require less fuel gas humidification.

(Column 10, lines 58-65.) This teaching of the Bahar et al. invention generically in polymer-electrolyte fuel cells is considered to encompass teaching the use of the membrane in direct methanol fuel cells. Thus, applicants' invention as a whole would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art based upon the teachings of Bahar et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record fails to suggest membrane assemblies as claimed having a polyester or polyimide layer which is substantially impervious to water and carbonaceous fuel.

Art Unit: 1745

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 24 February 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The prior art includes the features of a barrier layer (a PTFE layer) and protonically conductive layers on both major faces of the barrier layer. It would appear that the size of the pores in applicants barrier layer distinguishes applicants invention from the prior art. As noted by the applicants, in the instant invention, the pores in barrier layer 34 need only be large enough (relative to barrier thickness) to allow the proton conductive membrane materials 36a, 36b to make contact through the barrier layer, while remaining small enough to prevent the passage of liquid water, and to some extent methanol. In contrast, the pores formed in the barrier layer Bahar do not have specific size requirements. However, pore size limitation is not recited in applicants' claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carol Chaney whose telephone number is (571) 272-1284. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1745

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Carol Chaney Primary Examiner Art Unit 1745

17 May 2004